

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE MIDDLE DISTRICT OF PENNSYLVANIA**

**JAMES JOSEPH WILSON,**  
**Petitioner**

**v.**

**WARDEN BALTAZAR,**  
**Respondent**

:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:  
:

**No. 3:17cv1958**

**(Judge Munley)**

**(Magistrate Judge Arbuckle)**

.....

**ORDER**

**AND NOW**, to wit, this 29<sup>th</sup> day of October 2019, we have before us for disposition Magistrate Judge William Arbuckle's report and recommendation (Doc. 12), which proposes that petitioner's motion for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) be denied.

No objections to the report and recommendation have been filed, and the time for such filing has passed. Therefore, in deciding whether to adopt the report and recommendation, we must determine if a review of the record evidences plain error or manifest injustice. FED. R. CIV. P. 72(B) 1983 Advisory Committee Notes ("When no timely objection is filed, the court need only satisfy itself that there is no clear error on the face of the record to accept the recommendation"); see also 28 U.S.C. § 636(b)(1); Sullivan v. Cuyler, 723 F.2d 1077, 1085 (3d Cir. 1983).

After a careful review, we find neither a clear error on the face of the record nor a manifest injustice, and therefore, we shall adopt the report and recommendation. It is hereby **ORDERED** as follows:

1) The magistrate judge's report and recommendation (Doc. 12) is **ADOPTED**;

2) The petitioner's motion for writ of habeas corpus (Doc. 1) is **DENIED**;  
and

3) The Clerk of Court is directed to **CLOSE** this case.

BY THE COURT:



**JUDGE JAMES M. MUNLEY**  
United States District Court